

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
WESTERN DIVISION**

---

JOSHUA MALLORY,

Plaintiff,

v.

LIVING FOR CHRIST, et al.,

Defendants.

---

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

No. 2:21-cv-02408-SHL-cgc

---

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION AND  
DISMISSING COMPLAINT**

---

Before the Court is Magistrate Judge Charmiane G. Claxton's Report and Recommendation, (ECF No. 7), filed July 13, 2021, granting in forma pauperis status and recommending that the Court dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint, (ECF No. 1).

A magistrate judge may submit to a judge of the court proposed findings of fact and recommendations for dismissal of a complaint for failure to state a claim. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). "Within 14 days after being served with a copy of the recommended disposition, a party may serve and file specific written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); see also 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (2017). A district court reviews de novo only those proposed findings of fact or conclusions of law to which a party specifically objects; the rest are reviewed for clear error. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

Plaintiff objected to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation after the time to do so had expired. (ECF No. 8.) However, given his pro se status, the Court will consider his objections. There, Plaintiff adds only one detail, that he was allegedly subject to "sexual inuendo" and denied work by Defendants. (ECF No. 8.) Even considering this allegation, there is still not enough specificity to make out a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Moreover, Plaintiff

does not explain how Living for Christ, a non-government entity, and its Reverend were acting “under color of state law,” as is required to state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (ECF No. 8.) Generally, a plaintiff may only bring a § 1983 claim against a government entity or its employee. Churches are not government entities.

The Court has reviewed the Report for clear error and finds none. Therefore, the Court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge’s Report and **DISMISSES** the Complaint with prejudice.

**IT IS SO ORDERED**, this 3rd day of August, 2021.

s/ Sheryl H. Lipman  
SHERYL H. LIPMAN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE